



Washington Office of Superintendent of **PUBLIC INSTRUCTION**

PERFORMANCE-BASED EVALUATIONS - CERTIFICATED

1. **Purpose:**

Since September 2015, every certificated teacher and principal in Washington is being evaluated using a four-tiered evaluation process, which is based on an instructional or leadership framework and includes observations, other evidence, and measures of student growth. These funds support state-level activities designed to maintain and update a sustainable system for required professional learning for teachers and principals as they participate in this evaluation process.

2. **Description of services provided:**

OSPI staff provide technical assistance, create tools and resources, facilitate the TPEP Steering Committee and manage the work of the ESDs, the framework authors, the research team, the statewide cadre of framework specialists who train teachers, principals, and principal evaluators, partner organizations, and the training grants provided to all 295 school districts. View the [TPEP website](#) for more information.

3. **Criteria for receiving services and/or grants:**

All school districts are required to participate in the revised evaluation system, and have access to statewide programs of support through OSPI, Educational Service Districts (ESDs), the Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession (CSTP), the Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP), and the Washington Association of School Administrators (WASA). All districts are allocated training funding through program RC1, and most complete an iGrant in order to make claims for it.

Beneficiaries in 2020-21 School Year:

Number of School Districts:	295
Number of Schools:	All
Number of Students:	All
Number of Educators:	All
Other: <i>Name other...</i>	NA

Number of OSPI staff associated with this funding (FTEs): 2.6

Number of contractors/other staff associated with this funding: 28

FY21 Funding: State Appropriation: \$3.418 million

Federal Appropriation: \$0
Other fund sources: \$0
TOTAL (FY21) \$3.418 million

4. **Are federal or other funds contingent on state funding?**

- No
 Yes, please explain.

Yes. If state funds are not available, the state will not be implementing with fidelity its equity plan in ESSA (Title II, Part A)

5. **State funding history:**

Fiscal Year	Amount Funded	Actual Expenditures
FY21	\$3,418,000	\$2,854,144
FY20	\$3,418,000	\$3,248,006
FY19	\$3,687,000	\$3,686,714
FY18	\$3,935,000	\$3,686,831
FY17	\$3,935,000	\$3,688,270
FY16	\$3,935,000	\$3,295,035
FY15	\$3,935,000	\$3,351,910
FY14	\$5,581,000	\$4,286,387

6. **Number of beneficiaries (e.g., school districts, schools, students, educators, other) history:**

Fiscal Year	Number of School Districts
FY21	295
FY20	295
FY19	295
FY18	295
FY17	295
FY16	295
FY15	295
FY14	Pilot

7. **Programmatic changes since inception (if any):**

The program continues to be refined to better meet the professional learning and growth needs of teachers, principals, and systems. Ongoing activities include service agreements to support framework, student growth, rater agreement, and evaluation

systems learning at ESDs statewide; ongoing development of the state's cadre of over one hundred instructional and leadership framework specialists; support for eVAL, the electronic evaluation management system; continued development of the "Equity in Your Framework" professional learning; and a growing focus on culturally responsive pedagogy.

Some funds are being allocated to support novice principals and their evaluators (superintendents) with mentoring for their evaluation roles. Changes to the framework trainings to include a focus on cultural competency and equitable practices were incorporated and shared with the cadre of framework specialists; these continue to be refined. With previous funds provided by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, student perception survey questions were developed and vetted; these have been posted on the eVAL tool so teachers can access them and develop confidential, web-based surveys to administer to their students. Calibration videos and exercises for evaluators for all three instructional frameworks have also been created and are posted in eVAL. With the assistance of school, district, and ESD leaders, as well as CSTP, the program developed an "Evaluation and Growth System Toolkit" that allows districts and schools to assess their programs and see examples of best practices from around the state and nation.

Continuing in 2020-21 was work with Dr. Adeyemi Stenbridge, the author of "Culturally Responsive Education in the Classroom." Dr. Stenbridge held virtual, 18-hour residencies with groups of twenty teachers and their principals in the Camas, Kent, and Kelso school districts, where they collaboratively developed culturally responsive lessons and units. Their work, as well as that of teachers and administrators in the Vancouver School District, was shared with educators statewide through a virtual "Leadership Lab." Dr. Stenbridge's framework for culturally responsive teaching will continue to be a focus in the 2021-22 school year.

Another change for 2020-21 was the elevation of a small cadre of framework specialists to the position of "Framework Lead." These educators (which include a teacher, a school administrator, several district administrators, an ESD specialist, and a superintendent) have been able to take on several of the functions formerly handled by the national framework authors. While the authors will always have a role to play to ensure our work maintains fidelity with the national work, the Leads provide local context and a Washington lens to our continued development of the instructional framework professional learning. Increasingly, this has included pressing for a deeper and broader focus on racial equity and cultural responsiveness in the national work.

The 2020-21 school year was the expansion of the cadre of facilitators for the "Equity in Your Framework" professional learning. This will allow more reach for this

important training, which provides equity training for teacher evaluators trained in their frameworks prior to 2018.

8. **Evaluations of program/major findings:**

The program surveys districts annually for their aggregated teacher (by school) and principal (by district) evaluation scores using the School Employee Evaluation Survey (SEES). They also report the use of this data in personnel decisions, as well as their use of evaluation management systems. This data has remained constant over the years of TPEP implementation.

In March, 2019, the University of Washington's Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy completed and published a study to see how principals are handling the demands of the evaluation system on top of their many other duties. They found that the essential elements for productive engagement in teacher evaluation include:

- Leveraging the capacity of school leadership teams, so not all of the work to support professional growth sits on the shoulders of the principal;
- Having opportunities to collaborate and grow professionally with other principals, both on how they evaluate teachers and on their own evaluations;
- Integrating and aligning school initiatives, to ensure TPEP isn't seen as just one more "hoop" but rather part of the school's instructional priorities;
- Streamlining the evaluation process through efficient time management and delegation of tasks; and
- Staffing schools adequately, so the evaluation load is compatible with the actual capacity of the principal or leadership team to complete them in ways that support teacher growth.

The Executive Summary for the report is available [here](#).

9. **Major challenges faced by the program:**

With the COVID crisis and the impacts on the education system, the extensive professional learning system supporting TPEP was quickly transitioned to a virtual format. The Framework Leads and the ESDs both played a key role in making these transitions, as did collaboration with the Center for Strengthening the Teaching Profession (CSTP) and the Association of Washington School Principals (AWSP). The change in format provided both some challenges and some new opportunities.

10. **Future opportunities:**

There were benefits to the transition of all required trainings to a virtual format. While framework specialists believe the connections they make with principals and teachers who participate in virtual training are less robust, the savings in travel time and costs, and the flexibility to join a session offered from any ESD in the state, offered clear benefits. Now that both live and virtual formats for professional

learning have been developed, OSPI and ESDs are able to provide a number of options for the required trainings.

In the fall of 2020, the Student Growth Goal evaluation process was revised to better incorporate student voice and experience, and make the process more reflective for teachers and principals. These changes are being further developed and piloted in 2021-22.

11. **Statutory and/or budget language:**

Budget Proviso: ESSB 5092 Section 1511(2)(b) - \$3,418,000 of the general fund-state appropriation for fiscal year 2020 and \$3,418,000 of the general fund-state appropriation for fiscal year 2021 are provided solely for implementation of a new performance-based evaluation for certificated educators and other activities as provided in chapter 235, Laws of 2010 (education reform) (E2SSB 6696) and chapter 35, Laws of 2012 (certificated employee evaluations).

12. **Other relevant information:**

Click or tap here to enter text.

13. **Schools/districts receiving assistance:**

See [OSPI's Grantee List](#)

14. **Program Contact Information:**

Name: Sue Anderson

Title: Director, Educator Effectiveness

Phone: 360-725-6116

Email: sue.anderson@k12.wa.us